

pre



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,025	05/15/2001	Kevin Collins	10006733-1	2472

7590 08/20/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/858,025	COLLINS, KEVIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thong H Vu	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-7,19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Modzelesky et al [Modzelesky 5,842,125].
3. As per claim 1, Modzelesky discloses a method for centrally managing a number of devices on a network, comprising:

determining whether a device interface for each of said number of devices conforms with a standard interface [Modzelesky, assign circuits to meet the requirements of mobile customers, col 1 lines 25-33; standard interfaces, col 9 lines 34-52];

translating said device interface to conform with said standard interface when said device interface is nonconforming [Modzelesky, converts them into voice, data, fax, signals, col 9line 60-col 10 line 23]; and

managing said number of devices according to said standard interface [Modzelesky, col 9 lines 34-52].

4. As per claim 2, Modzelesky discloses discovering said number of devices on said network [Modzelesky, monitoring by NOC, col 31 lines 25-col 32 line 33].

5. As per claim 3, Modzelesky discloses a) obtaining network data for said number of devices, i.e.: phone numbers; and b) identifying said number of devices on said network based on said obtained network data the MET may only make calls to the numbers on the list, col 43 line 60-col 44 line 6].

6. As per claim 4, Modzelesky discloses managing said number of devices comprises monitoring said number of devices for an event [Modzelesky, monitoring by NOC, col 31 lines 25-col32 line 33].

7. As per claim 5, Modzelesky discloses monitoring said number of devices for an event [Modzelesky, monitoring by NOC, col 31 lines 25-col32 line 33] comprises:

a) receiving a device trap representing said event from at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, call trap flag, col 44 lines 7-11]; and

b) notifying an administrator of said event in response to receiving said device trap [Modzelesky, generates alarm reports, col 11lines 7-30; notified the Call Manager, col 41 lines 47-50].

Art Unit: 2142

8. As per claim 6, Modzelesky discloses managing said number of devices comprises obtaining attributes for at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, supply attributes of a resources, col 47 lines 10, default attribute values, col 50 lines 1-3].
9. As per claim 7, Modzelesky discloses managing said number of devices further comprises changing said attributes for said at least one device [Modzelesky, supply attributes of a resources, col 47 lines 10, default attribute values, col 50 lines 1-3].
10. Claims 19-21 contain the similar limitations set forth of claims 1,4,6 respectively. Therefore, claims 19-21 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claims 1,4,6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 9-18,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Modzelesky et al [Modzelesky 5,842,125] in view of Aditham et al [Aditham 6,192,419 B1].
12. As per claim 9, Modzelesky discloses an apparatus for centrally managing a number of devices on a network, comprising:

computer readable storage media; computer readable program code stored on said computer readable storage media [Modzelesky, NOC computer and software, col 5 lines 1-12], comprising:

a) program code for determining whether a device interface for each of said number of devices conforms with a standard interface [Modzelesky, assign circuits to meet the requirements of mobile customers, col 1 lines 25-33; standard interfaces, col 9 lines 34-52];

b) program code for translating said device interface to conform with said standard interface when said device [Modzelesky, converts them into voice, data, fax, signals, col 9 line 60-col 10 line 23];

However Modzelesky does not explicitly detail c) interface is nonconforming, and program code for managing said number of devices according to said standard interface.

A skilled artisan would have motivation to improve the conversion process and found Aditham teaching. Aditham discloses a collaborative framework for disparate (or nonconforming) application programs wherein the system using a converter is included with a standard interface in collaborative manager [Aditham, col 4 lines 33-51].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate technique of using the standard interface included the converter as taught by Aditham into the Modzelsky's apparatus in order to utilize the standard interface. Doing so would provide a single agent for directing message between each program running on the computer and session object

wherein the incoming data will be handle either by the converter or the standard interface.

13. As per claim 10, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said program code for managing is embodied at least in part in a network management application [Modzelesky, manage and control the network resources, abstract].

14. As per claim 11, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose program code for discovering (i.e.: monitoring) said number of devices on said network [Modzelesky, monitoring by NOC, col 31 lines 25-col 32 line 33].

As per claim 12, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose a graphical user interface (GUI) for user management of said number of devices [Aditham, GUI, col 9 lines 60-67].

15. As per claim 13, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said program code for managing comprises program code for receiving a device trap from at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, call trap plag, col 44 lines 7-11].

16. As per claim 14, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said program code for managing comprises program code for notifying an administrator when a device trap is received from at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, generates alarm reports, col 11lines 7-30; notified the Call Manager, col 41 lines 47-50].

17. As per claim 15, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said program code for managing comprises program code for obtaining attributes for at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, supply attributes of a resources, col 47 lines 10, default attribute values, col 50 lines 1-3].

18. As per claim 16, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said attributes include at least an indicator of the health of said at least one of said number of devices as inherent feature of monitoring network.

19. As per claim 17, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose program code for changing at least one attribute of said at least one of said number of devices [Modzelesky, parameter update, col 31 lines 50-55].

20. As per claim 18, Modzelesky-Aditham disclose said program code for translating comprises:

a translation library [Modzelesky, database, col 36 line 50-col 37 line 4];
program code for reading said nonconforming device interface [Modzelesky, converts them into voice, data, fax, signals, col 9 line 60-col 10 line 23]; and
program code for cross-referencing at least part of said nonconforming device interface with said standard interface based on said translation library.

Art Unit: 2142

21. Claims 8,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Modzelesky et al [Modzelesky 5,842,125] in view Lindquist et al [Lindquist 5,852,660].

22. As per claim 8, Modzelesky discloses translating comprises reading said nonconforming device interface [Modzelesky, converts them into voice, data, fax, signals, col 9line 60-col 10 line 23];

However Modzelesky does not detail cross-referencing at least part of said nonconforming device interface with said standard interface as inherent feature of signal conversion.

It was well-known in the telecommunications art that when two systems are incompatible and a converter module (i.e.: gateway) references a conversion table/ database/ library storing parameter/attribute values and their cross-referencing pointers to achieve the task [Lindquist, col 6 line 64-col 7 line 7].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of cross-referencing by conversion module to provide the compatible interface in telecommunications system as taught by Lindquist into the Modzelesky's apparatus in order utilize the conversions process. Doing so would provide a dynamic and efficiency to the management and control the network communications.

23. Claim 22 contains the similar limitations set forth of claim 8. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 8.

Art Unit: 2142

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thong Vu', with a horizontal line underneath.